UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/965,610	09/26/2001	Adam S. Cantor	56032US022	8132	
	7590 07/28/200 IVE PROPERTIES CO	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 33427		GHALI, ISIS A D			
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1611		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/28/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com LegalDocketing@mmm.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/965,610	CANTOR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ISIS A. GIIdii	1011	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06/24/2008</u>. A brief in of date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	· · ·	<del></del>	cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9,16-18,28-31,35-37,39-47 and 52-54	1		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>48-51 and 55-91</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Isis A Ghali/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1611	
	-		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claims have not amended and applicants repeat the same arguments regarding WO '229 and US '849, therefore, the examiner maintains her position as previously presented by the final office action. Further applicants argue that Roy et al. teach the same copolymer claimed by applicants and shows that not all the fentanyl is dissolved as required by the present claims. In response to this argument, it is argued that the copolymer disclosed by Roy et al. comprises copolymer containing 72% 2-ethylhexyl acrylate and 28% vinyl acetate, and the instantly claimed copolymer comprises about 52% to about 60% isooctyl acrylate, about 35% to about 40% 2-hydroxyethyl acrylate, about 1% to about 4% macromonomer, and 0% to about 10% vinyl acetate by weight. Therefore, the claimed polymer is totally different from the copolymer disclosed by Roy et al., therefore, does not have the same solubility to fentanyl.